



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,051	04/21/2005	Yoshio Hagino	1254-0279PUS1	6199
2292 7590 05/05/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
CHON, PETER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/05/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/532,051

Applicant(s)

HAGINO, YOSHIO

Examiner

PETER CHON

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/28/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04/21/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/22/07 & 04/21/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Both claims 9 and 10 define a program, embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a computer readable medium and is thus non-statutory for that reason. That is, the scope of the presently claimed program can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claims to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" or equivalent to make the claim statutory (ie. "a computer readable medium encoded with a computer program for executing..."). Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murakami, USPAT 6359650.

As to claim 1, Murakami discloses a focus state display comprising:

focus state judging means for judging whether or not an image captured from imaging means is in a focus state (*fig. 2A, 11, focus detection circuit; The focus detection circuit performs a hill-climb type auto focus adjustment to maximize the evaluation value on the basis of the image pickup signal (col. 5, lines 25-30).*); and

focus state display means for indicating information that indicates the focus state according to the focus state obtained by the focus state judging means on display means (*fig. 4A and fig. 4B; col. 6, lines 50-62; An indicator indicating an in focus state is displayed. In the instance where the image is out of focus, indicators (arrows) the direction of focus adjustment required (direction of arrows) and the magnitude of the movement required (bars of each arrow).*).

As to claim 2, Murakami discloses A focus state display, comprising:

focus state judging means for judging whether or not an image captured from imaging means is in a focus state (*A microprocessor (fig. 2A, 13) determines whether all of the distance measurement areas (A1-A4) are in a in-focus state (col. 7, lines 47-51). The determination is executed by comparing the current lens position to a position in which the*

maximum evaluation values were captured. Or, in other words, the current lens position evaluation values are compared to the maximum evaluation values (col. 7, lines 66).);

focus state storage means for storing temporal progress of the focus states of images obtained by the focus state judging means with temporal progress of the captured images (*The microprocessor (focus state judging means), which controls a focus detection circuit, 11, of fig. 2A (col. 4, lines 40-42), determines and stores the temporal progress of the captured images by controlling the focus detection circuit, 11, to find and store the in-focus evaluation values of the current (temporal) image within each distance measurement areas (col. 7, lines 35-44). Thus, the focus state judging means (microprocessor) determines and stores the temporal progress (or in other words temporal focus position) in a temporal image (current image to be captured).);*);

focus direction judging means for judging a focus direction from the temporal progress of the focus states obtained by the focus state storage means (*The focus evaluation values are compared to the temporal progress, stored in the focus state storage means (col. 7, lines 58-66). Subsequently, the microprocessor, 13, determines the display contents (col. 8, lines 1-3), and displays the out-of-focus amount and focusing direction (col. 8, lines 11-12));* and

focus state display means that, according to the focus direction obtained by the focus direction judging means, displays information that indicates its focus state and focus direction on display means (*The microprocessor, 13, determines the display contents*

(col. 8, lines 1-3), and displays the out-of-focus amount and focusing direction (col. 8, lines 11-12).);

As to claim 3, Murakami discloses the focus state display according to either claim 1 or claim 2, wherein

the focus state display means indicates the focus state obtained by the focus state judging means with a plurality of graphic forms as many as a number according to its focused state (*fig. 4B; The focus is displayed by displaying an arrow consisting of three bars, which indicates the degree of movement required for proper focus. In addition, the focus display comprises a circle, which is filled in when in focus (col. 6, lines 58-65).*).

As to claim 4, Murakami discloses the focus state display according to either claim 1 or claim 2, wherein

the focus state display means indicates the focus direction obtained by the focus direction judging means with symbols (*fig. 4B; The focus is displayed by displaying an arrow consisting of three bars, which indicates the degree of movement required for proper focus and the movement direction. In addition, the focus display comprises a circle, which is filled in when in focus (col. 6, lines 58-65).*).

As to claim 8, Murakami discloses a portable terminal device comprising **imaging means** (*fig. 1, b*) for picking up an image and **display means** (*fig. 1, e*) for displaying the image obtained by the imaging means, further comprising **the focus state display** according to claim 1 (*figs. 1, 2 and 4; The electronic camera, 100, as disclosed in figs 1-2 encompasses the focus state display as disclosed within the above claim 1.).*

As to claim 9, please refer to the above claim 1.

As to claim 10, please refer to the above claim 2.

As to claim 11, please refer to the above claim 1.

As to claim 12, please refer to the above claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami, USPAT 6359650, in view of Singh et al, USPAT 6937284.

As to claim 5, Murakami discloses the focus state display according to either claim 1 or claim 2, **but fails to disclose** the focus state display to comprise a light emitting means, wherein the focus state display means indicates the focus state obtained by the focus state judging means by making the light emitting means blink or turn on (*The in-focus state is displayed by filling in the circle (fig. 4B). There is no disclosed emitting light.*).

Singh, however, discloses a focus state display means which indicates the current focus state of an image by emitting light through a plurality of LED's, which signifies the level of focus (*fig. 5, 100; col. 10, lines 7-8*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to incorporate the plurality of LED's, signifying the current focus state, as disclosed within the focus state display of Singh, within the focus state display of Murakami, in order to provide an alternative, and more eye catching method of indicating the focus state of the image.

As to claim 6, Murakami in view of Singh discloses the focus state display according to either claim 1 or claim 2, **further comprising sounding means**, wherein the focus state display means informs the user of the focus state obtained by the focus state judging means by making the sounding means emit voice or sound (*Singh; col. 10, lines 27-42; A sonic transducer, 92, emits an audible sound which indicates the focus level.*).

Claims 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Murakami, USPAT 6359650**, in view of **Na, 6545715**.

As to claim 7, Murakami discloses the focus state display according to either claim 1 or 2, **but fails to disclose** the focus state display to further comprise filtering means for eliminating high spatial frequency components of image data, wherein the focus state display displays the image data by removing a wider range of high spatial frequency components with a filtering means as the focus state becomes worse based on the focus state obtained by the focus state judging means.

Na, however, discloses a focus control apparatus and method comprising an adaptive filter, reducing errors due to noise by removing high-frequency noise in a low-frequency area of the image, resulting in a more precise focus value (*col. 8, lines 36-43*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to incorporate the step of removing high-frequency noise from the image signal, as disclosed by Na, within the focus detecting/displaying apparatus, as disclosed by Murakami, in order to obtain a more precise focusing (*Murakami discloses a focus detection circuit which detects a focus position for each distance measurement area (col. 7, lines 39-44). The focus position is then compared to a current position of the camera, to determine if the camera is in focus (col. 7, lines 47-57). The removal of high-frequency noise, as disclosed by Na, in finding the focus points, as disclosed by Murakami, results in a superior focus measurement, which will be compared to the current camera position (as disclosed by Murakami), resulting in the focus state/movement direction being displayed.*).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Chon whose telephone number is 571-270/2-1556. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon-Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NgocYen Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PC/
04/27/2008

*/Ngoc-Yen T. VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622*